



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,473	02/28/2002	Andreas F. Kotowski	RAPI-011	2361
7590	06/08/2004		EXAMINER	
David B. Ritchie THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP P.O. Box 640640 San Jose, CA 95164-0640			NGUYEN, MINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2816	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/086,473	KOTOWSKI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Nguyen	2816

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' response filed on 5/18/04 has been received and entered. Claims 1-27 are pending. New grounds of rejections necessitated by the amendment are set forth below. This action is FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As per claim 15, the specification does not enable the newly added limitation which is the object and the concealed items transmit substantially no through x-rays, i.e., nowhere in the specification describes the "through x-rays" and/or the "no-through x-rays" feature which is seen as the invention feature in the newly added limitation. Specifically, the invention merely concerns about detecting the x-ray scattered as a result of interacting with the object and the low Z material panel wherein the object located between the detector and the panel (see abstract). Since the newly added limitation is a

new matter which is never mentioned and/or disclosed in the original specification, this newly added limitation is not permitted.

As per claims 1-14 and 16-27, the same problem exists as discussed in claim 1.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 15, the recitation the object and the concealed items transmit substantially no through x-rays is unclear and confusing. Further the recitation appears conflicting with the description in the specification. The evidence of the conflicting is that the specification discloses the object can be a human body (see Fig. 5), it is clear that human body transmit *substantial* through x-rays. Further evidence of the conflicting is shown paragraph 24 of the specification when the concealed item is between the foot of a human body and the low Z material floor panel, i.e., it does not make sense to detect the concealed item if the beam is not allowed to transmit through the foot before reaching the floor panel and reflecting back to the foot.

As per claims 1 and 14, the same problem exists as discussed in claim 1.

As per claims 2-13 and 16-27, these claims are rejected because of the indefiniteness of their independent claims.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,974,247, issued to Friddell.

As per claim 15, Friddell discloses an apparatus (Fig. 1) to detect concealed items on or in an object (see the abstract), comprising:

an x-ray source (12) and a scanner (18), the x-ray source to produce a pencil beam (column 5, lines 22-23) to an object (16);

a detector (34) to detect x-rays scattered (column 5, last line, column 6, lines 1-19) as a result of interacting with the object (16) and a low Z material panel (32, see column 6, line 42, i.e., low atomic sheet material), the object 16 is clearly located between the detector (34) and the panel (32).

Regarding the limitation the object and concealed items transmit substantial no through x-rays, no patentable weight is given to this limitation because the invention is about the apparatus for detecting the object and concealed items, i.e., the invention is not about the object and the concealed items which is able to transmit substantial no through x-rays.

As per claim 16, the recited limitation reads on the processor (38).

As per claim 17, the recited limitation reads on the display unit (42).

As per claim 1, this claim is merely a method to operate the apparatus noted in claim 15, since Friddell teaches the apparatus, he inherently teaches the method to operate.

As per claims 2-3, rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 16-17, respectively.

As per claim 14, same rejection as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-13 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,974,247, issued to Friddell.

As per claim 18, Friddell discloses the apparatus as discussed in claim 15 but he does not explicitly disclose the low Z material is made of polyethylene as called for in the claim.

However, as ruled by the court, when the structure of the apparatus (overall conditions) are met, changing the material (the low Z material) from one to another to obtain the optimum condition is not patentable since the practice can be done by an average person skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Friddell panel (32) using a certain material such as polyethylene

for the motivation to obtain optimum images shown in the display when the Fujii apparatus is used to detect a certain, known Z object.

As per claims 19-20, these claims are rejected for the same reasons and motivations as discussed in claim 18.

As per claim 21, Friddell does not explicitly disclose a radiation shield as called for in the claim. However, this limitation is seen as obvious by a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made since human being are known for being harmed when exposed to x-ray beams, i.e., the apparatus needs radiation shields for safety purpose.

As per claims 22-25, materials such as steel, lead used as absorbing materials for radiation shield and the selection of the thickness of the materials are well-known in the art.

As per claim 26-27, adjusting the positions of the low Z material panels to obtain the optimum images is seen as an obvious adjusting for the same motivation discussed in claim 18.

As per claims 4-13, same rejections as claims 18-27.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/18/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the argument Friddell discloses through radiation to be detected whereas the claim requires no through radiation to be detected.

As discussed in the preceding rejection, this is the new matter because the specification of the present invention does not disclose this feature.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1748. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on 703-308-4876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 6/4/04

Minh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2816